II. REMARKS

1.   Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 22 remain in the application. Claims 19-21 have been cancelled without prejudice.

2.   Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 22 are patentable over the combination of Grover et al. (US 5,818,437 "Grover") in view of Yu et al. (US 5,852,414 "Yu").

As mentioned in the previous response, the combination of Grover and Yu fails to disclose or suggest a processor operable to automatically perform <u>a second comparison</u> of a second candidate group of characters to the set of stored words <u>if and only if</u> the first comparison is unsuccessful, where the second character group includes a second character of the predetermined characters related to the pressed key, as recited in claims 1 and 12.

The previous response also stated that the combination of Grover and Yu fails to disclose or suggest performing a first, second and third comparison of a suggested character, and automatically accepting the suggested character as a recognized character on the basis of the recognition of the pressed key, the pressure distribution of the pressed key, and the first, second, and third comparisons, as recited in claim 22.

Applicants find no disclosure in Grover or Yu related to automatically performing <u>a second comparison if and only if</u> the first comparison is unsuccessful as recited in claims 1 and 12.

In the previous response, the independent claims were amended to state that a second comparison is performed if <u>and only if</u> the comparison is unsuccessful. In Grover, the comparison procedure

2

is always the same; a comparison is made for all characters that relate to the pressed key. In Grover, there is no way to prioritize the characters of the pressed key. On the other hand, in the present invention the first character is selected on the basis of pressure distribution, and a first comparison is made with the first character. Because of this inventive prioritization of characters, it is not necessary to make a comparison for other characters if the first comparison is successful. As a result, a second comparison is made for a second character of the pressed key if <u>and only if</u> the first comparison is unsuccessful.

Yu discloses how correct characters are selected by using separate electrical contacts in each key for each alternative character. There is nothing in Yu related to a processor operable to automatically perform <u>a second comparison</u> of a second candidate group of characters to the set of stored words <u>if and only if</u> the first comparison is unsuccessful.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, and 22, and dependent claims 2-11, 13, and 15-18, are patentable over the combination of Grover and Yu.

Applicants respectfully note that the present office action does not address the differences between the claims of the present application as amended in the last response and the combination of Grover and Yu.

Applicants respectfully request that the previous amendments be considered and that the claims be allowed.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and

3

are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

_____   ___7 December 2004___
Joseph V. Gamberdell, Jr.   Date
Reg. No. 44,695

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512